

STATE OF INDIANA)
) SS:
COUNTY OF MARION)

BEFORE THE INDIANA DEPARTMENT
OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

ECEI

COMMISSIONER, INDIANA DEPARTMENT
OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT,

Complainant,

v.

GARY DEVELOPMENT COMPANY, INC.,

Respondent.

NOV 30 1990

OFFICE OF HEARINGS
A DEPARTMENT
OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

CAUSE NO. 90-W-J-428
(B-1357)

US EPA RECORDS CENTER REGION 5



435289

RESPONDENT'S FIRST SET OF
INTERROGATORIES TO THE COMPLAINANT

I.

Comes now the Respondent Gary Development Company, Inc. ("GDC"), by counsel, and hereby submits the following interrogatories to the Complainant to be answered by her under oath, fully, positively and without evasion on or before thirty (30) days after the receipt by counsel for Complainant of a copy of these interrogatories pursuant to the Indiana Rules of Civil Procedure.

II.

Duties of Answering Party

Attention is drawn to the duties of the Answering Party which include the following:

A. In answering these interrogatories, the Answering Party shall furnish all requested information, not subject to a valid objection, that is known by, or available or accessible to the

Answering Party or any of its attorneys, consultants, representatives, staff members or other agents.

B. If the Answering party is unable to answer fully any one of these interrogatories, it must answer it to the fullest extent possible. An evasive or incomplete answer, if made in bad faith, is deemed to be a failure to answer under Trial Rule 37(A)(3).

C. If the Answering Party objects to an interrogatory or a sub-part thereof as calling for information which is beyond the scope of discovery (e.g., "not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence," "work product," "unduly burdensome," etc.) it must, nevertheless, answer the interrogatory or sub-part thereof to the extent that it is not objectionable.

D. The Answering Party must supplement or correct its responses to these interrogatories without being requested to do so (i) as to the information thereafter acquired which would be responsive to these interrogatories requesting the identification and location of persons having knowledge of discoverable matters, (ii) as to any response when it is discovered to have been incorrect when made or when it is discovered to be no longer true.

E. Under Trial Rule 33(B) an interrogatory, otherwise proper, is not objectionable because it involves an opinion, contention or legal conclusion.

III.

Definitions

"Give the Details" is a request that when appropriate, the answer contains the details specified in paragraphs A through D below, including identification of all documents and oral communications relied upon or relevant thereto.

A. As to each course of action or conduct referred to, a statement of each act, event, transaction, occasion, incident, or matter claimed to be a part of the course of action or conduct, including:

1. The date, time and place when it occurred;
2. The identity of each person participating, and a statement of whom such person purported to represent; and
3. A statement of the subject matter.

B. As to each person referred to, a statement of his/her name, occupation, last known address, and last known employment.

C. As to each "document" mentioned or referred to in the answer, a statement of:

1. Its nature, i.e., contract, memorandum, report, recording, transcription, letter, etc.;
2. Its title, if any;
3. The date it was prepared;
4. The identity of each person who prepared it, participated in its preparation and/or signed it;
5. Its subject matter; and

6. The name and last known address of the person who presently has the custody of it.

D. As to each "oral communication" mentioned or referred to in the answer, a statement of:

1. The persons involved;
2. The date upon which it occurred;
3. Where it occurred, or if a telephone conversation, the place at which each person involved was located; and
4. What was said by each person involved.

IV.

INTERROGATORY 1: State your full name, age, address and official position with the Indiana Department of Environmental Management.

ANSWER:

INTERROGATORY 2: Give the details of, pursuant to the instructions above, of all observations made on or about August 1, 1990, by any employee, official or agent of the Complainant Commissioner or of the Indiana Department of

Environmental Management ("IDEM") at the facility owned and operated by GDC at Gary, Indiana, which may relate to any allegations set forth in the Complainant's Emergency Order or which are contemplated to be placed into evidence by the Complainant at the hearing now scheduled for January 28, 1991, herein.

ANSWER:

INTERROGATORY 3: Give the details, pursuant to the instructions above, of any sampling of leachate on or from GDC's facility and sampling of waters from the Grand Calumet River near

GDC's facility by any employee, official or agent of the Complainant Commissioner or IDEM between August 1, 1990, and the date of the Emergency Order on October 16, 1990.

ANSWER:

INTERROGATORY 4: Give the details, pursuant to the instructions above, of any chemical analysis for contaminants or other substances in leachate or waters collected from or on GDC's facility and waters collected from the Grand Calumet River by any employee, official or agent of the Complainant Commissioner or IDEM between August 1, 1990, and the issuance of the Emergency Order on October 16, 1990.

ANSWER:

INTERROGATORY 5: Describe all actions, either final or preliminary, by the Commissioner, the IDEM or the Indiana Environmental Management Board ("IEMB") taken regarding GDC's renewal application for a sanitary landfill operating permit submitted to the IEMB during approximately February, 1985. In the response give the details of any such actions or considerations pursuant to the instructions above.

ANSWER:

INTERROGATORY 6: Describe all actions, either final or preliminary, by the Commissioner, the IDEM or the IEMB which constitute a consideration of or discussion of the ATEC Report of Soil Borings submitted by GDC to the IEMB on November 15, 1985, to the IEMB Hearing Officer in Cause No. N-46 on June 5, 1986, and to the IDEM Commissioner on August 29, 1989, regarding the acceptability or non-acceptability of the permeability of the GDC's site's west wall as relates to the applicable provisions of the Settlement Agreement in Cause No. N-53 approved by the IEMB on February 28, 1983. When responding to this interrogatory,

give the details of any such actions or considerations pursuant to the instructions set forth above.

ANSWER:

INTERROGATORY 7: Describe all actions, either final or preliminary, by the Commissioner or the IDEM as to the processing of or consideration of the Petition for Variance filed by GDC's counsel with the Commissioner on August 29, 1989. When responding to this interrogatory, please give the details of any such consideration or actions pursuant to the instructions set forth above.

ANSWER:

INTERROGATORY 8: Give the details of why the Commissioner, the IDEM and the IEMB have never issued a determination on GDC's renewal application for a sanitary landfill submitted to the IEMB during 1985.

ANSWER:

INTERROGATORY 9: Give the details of why the Commissioner, the IDEM and the IEMB have never responded to GDC or its representatives as to whether or not the ATEC Report of Soil Borings and Permeabilities submitted to the IEMB on November 15, 1985, and to the IDEM Commissioner on August 29, 1989, demonstrate that the permeability of the GDC site's west wall meets the provisions of the Settlement Agreement in Cause No. N-53 approved by the Indiana Environmental Management Board on February 28, 1983.

ANSWER:

INTERROGATORY 10: Give the details as to why the Commissioner has failed to issue a determination or to provide any response or comments to GDC or its counsel regarding the Petition for Variance filed by GDC with the Commissioner on August 29, 1989.

ANSWER:

INTERROGATORY 11: Is it the technical opinion of the Commissioner and/or the IDEM staff that the IEMB approved construction area at the GDC sanitary landfill which remains below the final elevation approved by the Indiana Environmental Management Board by its construction permit issued to GDC should not be maintained by pumping the water which collects in this lower area back onto the surrounding higher elevations of the

site and surrounding property? If so, please give the details forming the basis for this opinion.

ANSWER:

INTERROGATORY 12: If the Commissioner is contending in the Emergency Order, or will contend at the hearing, that waters at GDC's facility which have passed through or merged from solid waste have been discharged to the Grand Calumet River, please specify the exact locations at the GDC facility where such waters were observed to be passing through or merging from solid waste on or about August 1, 1990, or between that date and the issuance of the Emergency Order on October 16, 1990.

ANSWER:

INTERROGATORY 13: If the Complainant is contending by the Emergency Order, or will contend at the hearing, that waters collected on the GDC site on or about August 1, 1990, or between August 1, 1990, and October 19, 1990, were discharged to the Grand Calumet River and that such collected waters contained soluble, suspended, or miscible materials removed from solid waste, please specify the particular chemical substances or materials, and their respective levels, which were contained in those collected waters on or about August 1, 1990, or between August 1, 1990, and October 16, 1990.

ANSWER:

INTERROGATORY 14: Identify the name, position and business or office address of each person, including any experts, whom the Commissioner intends or may call at the hearing on the merits, and for each summarize the testimony expected to be elicited from each such witness, including the facts and opinions and grounds therefore held by any expert to be called.

ANSWER:

INTERROGATORY 15: Identify by title, date, author and subject matter any documents or writings which you contend is or might be relevant to a determination of the issues set forth in the Commissioner's Emergency Order, including, but not limited to, any documents which the Commissioner or its counsel intends to offer into evidence at the hearing.

ANSWER:

PARR RICHEY OBREMSKEY & MORTON

Attorneys for Gary Development
Company, Inc.

By 
Warren D. Krebs

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the fore-
going Respondent's First Request Set of Interrogatories to the
Complainant has been served upon the following by personal
service on this 30 day of November, 1990:

Ihor N. Boyko
Attorney
Office of Legal Counsel
Indiana Department of
Environmental Management
105 South Meridian Street
Indianapolis, IN 46206


Warren D. Krebs

PARR RICHEY OBREMSKEY & MORTON
121 Monument Circle
Suite 500
Indianapolis, IN 46204
Telephone: (317) 269-2500